

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated December 7, 2009 ("*Office Action*"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-24, and 26-37 were pending. Claims 17-23 and 32-35 were withdrawn and Claims 1, 3-16, 24, 26-31, 36, and 37 were rejected. Applicants amend Claims 1 and 24, without prejudice or disclaimer, and add new Claim 38. Claims 2 and 25 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants' amendments and additions have been made to advance prosecution of the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in view of the following remarks.

#### **Formal Drawings**

Applicants submit formal drawings to replace the informal drawings originally filed with the Application. Applicants respectfully request acceptance and approval of the formal drawings.

#### **Summary of Examiner's Interview**

Applicants' attorney, Ms. Christa Brown-Sanford (Reg. No. 58,503), conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Mary Cheung on February 8, 2010. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy and opportunity to conduct the telephone interview. Applicants submit this summary of the telephone interview to record Applicants' understanding of the substance of the interview and to comply with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' attorney discussed the following rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The Examiner and Applicants' attorney also discussed claim amendments to advance prosecution of the case.

#### **Section 102 Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 8-12, 24, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,321,864 issued to Gendler ("*Gendler*"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Gendler* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, either expressly or inherently, each limitation recited in Applicants' Claim 1. For example, *Gendler* fails to disclose:

determining, for each request, at least one data item type to be provided by the requesting user, wherein:  
the at least one data item type determined for each request is based on a type of service included within the request; and  
communicating an indication of the at least one data item type for each request for approval for display on the user interface of the client device associated with the requesting user, wherein each requested service is separately approved

as recited in Claim 1. *Gendler* discloses that "the user is able to identify the proper personnel required to approve the [R]FA." Col. 8, ll. 8-9. The Examiner states that "different types of roles [] are categorized by three different data item types: business manager, business unit controller, and business executive." *Office Action* at 2. The different personnel to approve the RFA, as disclosed by *Gendler*, fails to disclose "the at least one data item type determined for each request is based on a type of service included within the request . . . , wherein each requested service is separately approved," as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, *Gendler* discloses that "[d]ifferent rules are capable of being set in the database 122 of system 100 such that depending on the scope of the project (typically the total dollar amount) the number of approvals will change." Col. 8, ll. 13-16. *Gendler*, however, fails to disclose that "the at least one data item type determined for each request is based on a type of service included within the request," as recited in Claim 1. As mentioned above, *Gendler* discloses that the number of approvals needed will change depending on "the **scope** of the project," not that the "data item type determined for each request is based on a **type** of service included within the request."

For at least this reason, *Gendler* fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 along with its dependent claims.

Independent Claim 24 recites certain limitations that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with reference to independent Claim 1, *Gendler* does not disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 24 together with its dependent claims.

**Section 103 Rejections**

**Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37**

The Examiner rejects Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gendler*. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-7 and 13, which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 26-27 and 36-37, which depend from Claim 24, are patentable over *Gendler* because the reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and also recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggest in *Gendler*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6-7, 13, 26-27, and 36-37.

**Claims 14 and 31**

The Examiner rejects Claims 14 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gendler* in view of Official Notice as evidenced by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0179790 issued to Leitch et al. ("*Leitch*"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14, which depends from Claim 1, and Claim 31, which depends from Claim 24, are patentable over *Gendler* in view of *Leitch* because each and every limitation as recited in Applicants' claims is not taught by *Gendler* in view of *Leitch*. Claims 14 and 31 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and also recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Gendler*. The Examiner's reliance on *Leitch* does not correct the deficiencies of *Gendler*.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 14 and 31.

**Claims 15-16 and 30**

The Examiner rejects Claims 15-16 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gendler* in view of Official Notice as evidenced by U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2002/0040313 issued to Hunter et al. ("*Hunter*"). For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15-16, which depends from Claim 1, and Claim 30, which depends from Claim 24, are patentable over *Gendler* in view of *Hunter* because each and every limitation as recited in Applicants' claims is not taught by *Gendler* in view of *Hunter*. Claims 15-16 and 30 incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and also recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Gendler*. The Examiner's reliance on *Hunter* does not correct the deficiencies of *Gendler*.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 15-16 and 30.

**New Claim**

Applicants add new Claim 38, which is fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of new Claim 38.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for Applicants at the Examiner's convenience.

The Examiner is authorized to charge \$405.00 for continued examination and \$136.00 for an additional independent claim to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. No other fees are believed to be due; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or credits to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Christa Brown-Sanford  
Reg. No. 58,503  
(214) 415-6824

Date: February 18, 2010

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. **05073**